



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EDITORIAL.

EDITORS, E. D. COPE AND J. S. KINGSLEY.

THE question is often asked the editors, With but limited funds, what journals related to biology should our college take? As others may be in the same position as these inquirers, the answer is made here. Of course this journal should occupy the first place, since it is the only American periodical which regularly presents abstracts of the more important papers in all departments of natural history. Next in importance is the *Journal of the Royal Microscopical Society* (London, \$7.50 a year), which, besides one or two original papers in each number, contains abstracts of work done in botany, zoology, and in microscopy and microscopical technique. The *Zoologischer Anzeiger* (Leipzig, \$4) presents every two weeks original communications upon zoology, and also a classified list of all zoological publications from all parts of the world. The *Anatomischer Anzeiger* (Jena, \$4) contains only anatomical and embryological papers, and an index to the current literature of those subjects. The *Biologisches Centralblatt* (Erlangen, \$4) is made up of original communications and longer résumés of zoological and botanical papers.

In the line of botany every library should have the *Botanical Gazette* (Crawfordsville, Indiana, \$2) and the *Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club* (New York, \$2). For the larger and more important papers the *Annals of Botany* (London), the *Annales des Sciences Naturelles Botanie* (Paris), the *Botanisches Centralblatt*, and the *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Botanik*, are the most indispensable.

For the original contributions to zoology the most useful are the *Journal of Morphology* (Boston, \$9), the *Quarterly Journal of Microscopical Science* (London, \$10), the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Zoologie* (Leipzig). Where more funds are available this list can be indefinitely increased.

—THE organ of the Brooklyn Entomological Society, *Entomologia Americana*, has ceased with the completion of its sixth volume. In the years which it has been running it contained a number of valuable papers on entomology, and especially was it noted for its synopses of the various groups of insects. In another aspect the demise of the journal is not to be regretted, for its editors apparently allowed everything that came to be published, and the result was that each number contained several articles each about a page in length. Such a course does not advance entomology; it is rather a drag upon it, for no one can by any possibility keep track of the multitude of short notes thus poured out, and by-and-by there may be quarrels resulting because somebody's ten-line squib has been overlooked. *Entomologia Americana* was, however, not alone in this fault.

—UNIFORMITY is in many respects desirable in many things, but uniformity may result in deformity. What a world this would be were all men to think alike! The editors of the AMERICAN NATURALIST have their little differences of opinion, but this does not interfere with the conduct of the magazine. For instance, one of our number exhibits tendencies towards a strict uniformity in geological nomenclature, while the other is more conservative, and perceives deformity in the uniformity of the newly modified names of the geological (geologic) ages. Triassic and Jurassic are good and long-accepted terms, but Siluric and Cretacic have a barbarous sound. Carbonic has a flavor of the deadly CO₂; and then Cambric!—it recalls handkerchiefs and pillow-slips, and anything except ancient Wales. However, the advocates of the new “terminatology” are not thoroughly consistent. Ancient roots should not stand in the way of Eocic, Miocic, Pliocic, and the like, when uniformity is to be gained.